

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/785,287	02/23/2004	Mark E. Thompson	10020/26502	2083	
26646 7590 07/10/2007 KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY			ĖXAM	ĖXAMINER	
			YAMNITZKY, MARIE ROSE		
NEW YORK,	NY 10004 ·		ART UŅIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1774		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	•	•	07/10/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/785,287	THOMPSON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Marie R. Yamnitzky	1774				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	VIS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH	(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS				
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING C  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	OATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e. cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
,	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 April 2007</u> .					
-,-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	.53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-50 and 53 is/are pending in the ap	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-50 and 53</u> is/are pending in the application.					
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>53</u> is/are rejected.	· · · —					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
o) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	·					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
	Adminor. Note the attached office					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents.	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv	tion No				
application from the International Burea  * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		ved				
See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not receiv	Cu.				
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/785,287 Page 2

Art Unit: 1774

1. This Office action is in response to applicant's amendment received April 09, 2007, which cancels claims 51 and 52, and amends claim 53.

This Office action is also in response to the Rule 132 Declaration of Raymond C. Kwong received April 09, 2007.

Claims 1-50 and 53 are pending.

- 2. Claims 1-50 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

  Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on September 26, 2006.
- 3. Applicant's amendment renders moot all rejections of claims 51 and 52 as set forth in the Office action mailed December 06, 2006.

Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, and the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Boden et al. (*Liquid Crystals* 28(1), pp. 139-144) or Wegewijs et al. (*Physical Review B*, Vol. 65).

4. The examiner has reconsidered the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishiskawa et al. (US 2002/0064679 A1) or Jarikov (US 2004/0076853 A1) and hereby withdraws the rejection. In the response filed April 09, 2007, applicant presents several pages of arguments with respect to this rejection, and the Rule 132 Declaration of Raymond C. Kwong is also directed to the rejection of claim 53 based on either of these two

Application/Control Number: 10/785,287 Page 3

Art Unit: 1774

references. Many of applicant's arguments and statements made in the Rule 132 Declaration are not persuasive. For example, statements/arguments regarding Jarikov's requirement for a flat structure are not persuasive because Jarikov's compounds need not be entirely flat, only a portion of the compound (such as the triphenylene core) need be flat. Contrary to applicant's arguments, Jarikov does disclose host compounds having a fused aromatic ring structure as the core with phenyl substituents on the core (e.g. see paragraph [1230]; rubrene is 5,6,11,12tetraphenylnaphthacene). As another example, statements/arguments made regarding the performance of an OLED having the compound of claim 53 in place of Balq are not persuasive as claim 53 is drawn solely to a compound, and the prior art does not teach the prior art triphenylene compounds for the same use as Balq. However, the examiner has reconsidered based on the breadth of triphenylene compounds disclosed by each of the two prior art references, given the lack of teachings in either of the references that would lead to substituted triphenylene compounds having six unsubstituted phenyl rings in the substitution pattern shown for the compound of claim 53, and given the specific examples of triphenylene compounds provided in the references, all of which lead away from the compound of claim 53.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

<sup>(</sup>b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1774

6. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-92420.

See page 5 of the document. Prior art compound TP-1, wherein each of  $R_{21}$ - $R_{26}$  in the formula at the top of page 5 is hydrogen, is the compound of present claim 53.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Marie R. Yamnitzky at telephone number (571) 272-1531. The examiner works a flexible schedule but can generally be reached at this number from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday-Friday.

The current fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300. (Unofficial faxes to be sent directly to examiner Yamnitzky can be sent to (571) 273-1531.)

MRY July 05, 2007

MARIE YAMNITZKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marie R. Yamintzhy

1774